RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
AUG 10 2006

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The above amendments cancel Claim 2, and hence, render this rejection moot.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-4 and 6-9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kobachi, *et al* (hereafter "Kobachi") (US 6,326,948). The above amendments cancel Claims 2 and 3, and hence, render this rejection moot with respect to those claims. Applicant traverses this rejection with respect to Claim 9, and Applicant submits that the remaining claims, as amended above are not anticipated by Kobachi.

The above amendments to Claim 1 essentially place the limitations of Claims 2 and 3 into Claim 1. While Kobachi teaches the use of a single spiral spring (Figures 29B and 30A-B), Kobachi does not teach two spiral springs acting in opposition to each other to maintain the spring in a predetermined region of the field of motion when no external force is applied to the puck. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Kobachi does not anticipate Claim 1 or the claims dependent therefrom.

With respect to Claim 7, the Examiner stated that Kobachi discloses that the material comprises plastic (col. 2, lines 34-36). Applicant must disagree with the Examiner's reading of the cited passage. The cited passage provides no information with respect to the type of material from which the layer of material having the hole defining the field of motion is constructed. The cited passage merely refers to the elastic structure that connects the puck to the structure in which the puck moves. Hence, there are additional grounds for allowing Claim 7

With respect to Claim 8, the Examiner stated that Kobachi discloses the material comprises metal (col. 2, lines 47-48). Again, Applicant must disagree with the Examiner's reading of the cited passage. The cited passage refers to the elastic structure being a spiral spring. The spring is not part of the layer of material having the hole. Furthermore, the passage does not disclose the material from which the spring is constructed.

With respect to Claim 9, the Examiner stated that Kobachi discloses the puck and the springs comprise a portion of said layer of material. (Fig. 27). First, there is no teaching in

Kobachi that the puck and springs shown in Figure 27 are part of a layer of material. Kobachi teaches that the elastic body in Figure 27 is a coil spring; however, the description of Figure 27 does not provide any information as the nature of the materials from which the spring and puck are made. Furthermore, there is no teaching that these elements are part of the layer of a material that defines the field of motion. Hence, Applicant submits that Claim 9 is not anticipated by Kobachi.

The Examiner rejected Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobachi in view of Devolpi (US 6,256,012). Applicant submits that Claim 5, as amended above, is not anticipated by the cited references. Applicant repeats the arguments made above with respect to the missing teachings in Kobachi with respect to Claim 1 from which Claim 5 depends. Devolpi does not provide the missing teachings. Hence, the combined references do not teach all of the limitations of Claim 5. Accordingly, the cited references do not render Claim 5 obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103.

I hereby certify that this paper is being sent by FAX to 571-273-8300.

Respectfully Submitted,

Calvin B. Ward
Registration No. 30,896
Date: Aug. 10, 2006

Avago Technologies, LTD.
P.O. Box 1920
Denver, CO 80201-1920
Telephone (925) 855-0413
Telefax (925) 855-9214